Incident Command Subcommittee
Meeting Agenda: January 8, 2020 (1400-1530 MT)

Present: Shane Greer (FS), Jon King (FWS), Ken Paul (Associate), Amy Ham (Support), Deb Fleming (NWCG Coordinator), Brian Harrison (Training Liaison), Brad Sawyer (BLM), Bob Gear (IAFC), Carlos Nosie Jr. (BIA)

Absent: Mike Minton (IPSC Liaison), Les Rogers (NASF), Rick Young (NPS)

	Topic	Action Item #	Presenter	Notes	Action/Decision
1	**Introductions**		ICSC	• Roll call	
2	**Approval of Minutes**		Ham	• Reviewed and approved notes from 12/4/19. Made a correction to Bob's last name under the action/decision column.	
3	**Draft IPDs**		All	• Reviewed draft IPDs-Each person summarized the process used to develop the ones they worked on. ACDR-Rick Young-not on the call AREP-Shane Greer • When started looking into this, realized there wasn't a taskbook for this position. PMS 310-1 does describe it but, each agency determines who is qualified for the position. • These aren't used in the FS anymore, just use Agency Administrators. BIA does use this qualification, but doesn't require a taskbook to be qualified. Line officers learn through OJT. It needs to be more clearly defined. • Carlos will send an example of what this position is and how it's used within his agency. • Deb will pull data out of ROSS about their mobilizations to assess. ICT1-Bob Gear • Looked at examples and compared this to his personal experience when developing the ICT1 IPD. Doesn't know if has left anything out. ICT2-Les Rogers- not on the call ICT3-Brad Sawyer • Utilized experience and other ICs to gather thoughts. Tried to capture variety of ways an ICT3 will be used due to the fact duties can vary greatly. Used taskbook competencies. Fireline duties tied	

				in as well. Good initial draft but more to be developed. Need to talk to folks to get views of different agencies due to all different types of uses. • Tried not to get in the weeds, but can get more specific if need to. Deb's thoughts are not to go too deep. ICT4-Jon King • Used standard statements verbatim or edited them. Used some statements from the DIVS IPD as well as personal experience. Tried to focus more on the IA side with the realization that this position may act more like ICT3 in some instances. Deb sent an email with draft ICT4 IPD that was done previously so can compare. ICT5-Carlos Nosie • Looking at FFT1 IPD was helpful. Tried to stay in mid-range between that and ICT4. Looked at taskbook as well. LOFR-Ken Paul • Looked at wildland incident management field guide as well as the PIO IPD. Made notations of who the SME was. There will be redundancies in IPDs and that's ok. • What is the difference between ICT1 & ICT2 versus ICT4 & ICT5? For type 1 and 2 it's the same taskbook. So when working through this is the job actually different or just complexity? It was agreed upon complexity is really the only difference for Type 1 and 2. They will probably remain separate, but the wording can be the same except maybe an additional sentence on complexity. Bob and Les will work together to get alignment between the two. • ICT4 and 5 are 2 separate taskbooks, but have a lot of similarities. Prerequisite for ICT4 is single resource boss. The way ICT5s are being utilized on crews may need to be brought into the IPD. It's part of redbook crew standards as well. • The intended audience for utilizing the IPDs is firefighters and will also be used when deciding what to endorse when looking at FEMA positions and for dictating what goes into trainings and taskbooks.	
4	**ICT3 Fitness Standard**	2020-01	Greer	• Follow-up to last meeting. Discussion on whether the ICT3 position still needs to be arduous or if it could be moderate. • Ken got feedback back from one fire chief. He feels it's not an arduous job anymore due to fact C&G positions are usually filled. • Carlos-met with BIA regional leadership FMOs and came up with consensus to keep it arduous.	**<u>Decision:</u>** **Will remain an arduous position.**

				• Jon-took it to Leadship Team. Most wanted to keep it arduous due to transition between initial attack and Type 3 complexity. • Brad-consensus was to keep it arduous. Some referenced experience in urban interface situations and others back country situations. • Shane-for FS folks that he talked to some said drop to moderate, but most said keep arduous. • The overall consensus was to keep it categorized as arduous.	
5	**MEDL, SOFR, SOF2, SOF1**	2020-02	Fleming	• ICSC is listed as key stakeholder for MEDL, SOFR, SOF2, and SOF1. Is that appropriate? What about PIOF, PIO2, and PIO1? • Definition of key stakeholder is someone or an entity that has a critical stake in a key component of a system stewarded by another entity. • Discussed whether this group wants to be listed as key stakeholder? • It was determined that MEDL falls under risk and ICSC will be removed from that one. ICSC should be tied to command positions. It will be added to PIO and is already on SOF.	**<u>Decision:</u>** **The ICSC will not be a key stakeholder for MEDL, but will be for the SOF and PIO positions.**
6	**Moving Forward**		All	• Going forward folks can review what the others have done to compare and use them as needed. • Prior to the next call, everyone will polish up the IPDs that they are assigned. Also, determine if you want to meet face to face to review them or if sending comments around will suffice. • Due date-There is no hard and fast due date. They can be posted before they are final. Once the IPDs are online they will listed as under review for 2 months. Changes can still be made during that time.	

Next Conference Call
Date: February 12, 2020
Time: 1400-1530 MST

Phone # 877-954-4805
Passcode 4545300